

An improved explicit bound on $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$

D.J. Platt

Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research
University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
dave.platt@bris.ac.uk

and

T.S. Trudgian*

Mathematical Sciences Institute
The Australian National University, ACT 0200, Australia
timothy.trudgian@anu.edu.au

October 20, 2014

Abstract

This article proves the bound $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 0.732t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t$ for $t \geq 2$, which improves on a result by Cheng and Graham. We also show that $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 0.732|4.678 + it|^{\frac{1}{6}} \log |4.678 + it|$ for all t .

1 Introduction

The Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(s)$ is known [4] to satisfy $\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it) \ll_{\epsilon} t^{\frac{32}{205} + \epsilon}$ for all $t \gg 1$ and for every $\epsilon > 0$. Explicit estimates of the sort

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq k_1 t^{k_2} (\log t)^{k_3}, \quad (t \geq t_0)$$

are difficult to produce since, attempts at small values of k_2 lead to complicated arguments in the calculation of k_1 . Using the approximate functional equation and the Riemann–Siegel formula one may show that

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq \frac{4}{(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}}} t^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad (t \geq 0.2). \quad (1)$$

Lehman [7, Lem. 2] proved this for $t \geq 128\pi$ — see also [10, Thm 2] and [14, Thm 1] — one may verify that (1) holds in the range $0.2 \leq t < 128\pi$ by direct

*Supported by Australian Research Council DECRA Grant DE120100173.

computation. The only other result of which we are aware is due to Cheng and Graham [1], viz.

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 3t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t, \quad (t \geq e). \quad (2)$$

The upper bound in (2) is smaller than that in (1) when $t \geq 1.4 \times 10^{21}$. This is unfortunate since for some problems one seeks information for $t \geq T_0$, where T_0 is at most the height to which the Riemann hypothesis has been verified. The first author [8] has confirmed that for $0 \leq t \leq 3.06 \times 10^{10}$ all non-trivial zeroes of $\zeta(\sigma + it)$ lie on the critical line.

In [13, (5.4)] the second author showed that one could combine Theorem 3 of [1] with (1) to show that

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 2.38t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t, \quad (t \geq e),$$

which is better than the bound in (1) only when $t \geq 10^{19}$. The purpose of this article is to revisit the paper by Cheng and Graham and to prove

Theorem 1.

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 0.732t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t, \quad (t \geq 2).$$

The bound in Theorem 1 improves on that in (1) whenever $t \geq 5.868 \times 10^9$. Three applications are apparent: [9, 12, 13] which respectively relate to explicit estimates for zero-density theorems, bounding $\int_0^T S(t) dt$, and bounding $S(t)$, where $\pi S(t)$ is the argument of the zeta-function on the critical line. More precisely, when t does not coincide with an ordinate of a zero of $\zeta(\sigma + it)$, $S(t)$ is defined as

$$S(t) = \pi^{-1} \arg \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it),$$

where the argument is determined via continuous variation along the straight lines connecting $2, 2 + it$ and $\frac{1}{2} + it$, with $S(0) = 0$. If t is such that $\zeta(\sigma + it) = 0$ then define $S(t)$ to be $\frac{1}{2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \{S(t - \epsilon) + S(t + \epsilon)\}$.

The estimate for $S(t)$ can be improved immediately to give

Corollary 1. *If $T \geq e$, then*

$$|S(T)| \leq 0.110 \log T + 0.290 \log \log T + 2.290.$$

Proof. Using Theorem 1 one may take $(k_1, k_2, k_3) = (0.732, 1/6, 1)$ in [13, (4.8)]. Instead of choosing $Q_0 = 2$ on page 291 of [13], we choose $Q_0 = 5$. The choice of $\eta = 0.064, r = 2.032$ on the same page establishes Corollary 1. $\square$

This improves the constant term in Theorem 1 [13] from 2.510 to 2.290.

The improvement of Theorem 1 over the result in [1] comes from two ideas. First, an explicit form of the ‘standard’ approximate functional equation is used (cf. Lemma 3), in which one needs to estimate sums of the form $\sum_{n \leq Y} n^{it}$, where $t^{\frac{1}{2}} \ll Y \ll t^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This requires only one round of applying estimates for exponential sums. Cheng and Graham considered an approximation to $\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)$ in which one needs to estimate a longer sum with $t \ll Y \ll t$. They require

two different estimates for exponential sums to cover this range. Second, some minor adjustments are made to some of the results in [1], and more variables are optimised.

We prove some necessary lemmas in §2. We prove Theorem 1 for large t in §3 and for small t in §4. We conclude with some computational remarks in §5.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Olivier Ramaré for helpful suggestions and comments.

2 Preparatory Lemmas

It is necessary to record some estimates for exponential sums. Versions of the following lemmas without explicit constants can be found in [11, Thm 5.9 and Lemma 5.10]. Slightly coarser explicit versions can be found in [5, p. 36] and [3, Lemma 2.2]

Lemma 1. *Assume that $f(x)$ is a real-valued function with two continuous derivatives when $x \in [N+1, N+L]$. If there exist two real numbers $V < W$ with $W > 1$ such that*

$$\frac{1}{W} \leq |f''(x)| \leq \frac{1}{V}$$

for $x \in [N+1, N+L]$, then

$$\left| \sum_{n=N+1}^{N+L} e^{2\pi i f(n)} \right| \leq \left(\frac{L-1}{V} + 1 \right) \left(2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} W^{1/2} + 2 \right) + 1.$$

Proof. This is Lemma 3 in [1] with three slight adjustments. First, when applying the mean-value theorem on the first line of page 1268 of [1] one obtains $k \leq (L-1)/V + 2$ instead of $k \leq L/V + 2$. Second, when estimating the $2(k-1)$ intervals trivially, one may note that there are two intervals of length $W\Delta + 1$, namely those intervals from $(C_k - \Delta, C_k)$ and $(C_1, C_1 + \Delta)$, whereas there are $k-2$ intervals of length $2W\Delta + 1$. Third, we retain the constant $2\sqrt{2/\pi}$ as opposed to (the only slightly larger) $8/5$. $\square$

Lemma 2. *Let $f(n)$ be a real-valued function and let M be a positive integer. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{n=N+1}^{N+L} e^{2\pi i f(n)} \right|^2 \leq \frac{L(L+M-1)}{M} + \frac{2(L+M-1)}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \left(1 - \frac{m}{M} \right) \max_{K \leq L} \left| \sum_{m,K} \right|, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\sum_{m,K} = \sum_{n=N+1}^{N+K} e^{2\pi i (f(n+m) - f(n))}.$$

Proof. This is Lemma 5 in [1] with $L + M$ changed to $L + M - 1$, a substitution that is clearly permitted as per the displayed equation at the bottom of [1, p. 1272]. This differs from Lemma 5.10 in [11] in three respects: there is no upper restriction on M , the coefficients are smaller (in [11] both terms in (3) have 4 as their leading coefficients), and the factor $(1 - m/M)$ is present. $\square$

Lemma 3. For $t \geq 100$,

$$|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 2 \left| \sum_{n \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2\pi}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} \right| + 1.53t_0^{-\frac{1}{4}} + 3.23t_0^{-\frac{3}{4}}. \quad (4)$$

Proof. We use Theorem 1 [10], from which it follows that

$$|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 2 \left| \sum_{n \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2\pi}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} \right| + \frac{|\Gamma(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)|}{2\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi t} (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} |g(\tfrac{t}{2\pi})| + |R(s)|, \quad (5)$$

where, in Titchmarsh's expression for $R(s)$, there appears to be a blemish on the page: the $\frac{8}{3}$ ought to be $\frac{8}{5}$, as per equation (4.1) of [10]. By the last line on p. 235 of [10]) we have

$$|g(\tfrac{t}{2\pi})| \leq (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}} t^{-\frac{1}{4}} \left| \frac{\cos 2\pi(x^2 - x - \frac{1}{16})}{\cos 2\pi x} \right|, \quad (6)$$

where $0 \leq x \leq 1$. By (2.6) and (2.7) of [6] we have $|g(\tfrac{t}{2\pi})| \leq (\cos \frac{\pi}{8})(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}} t^{-\frac{1}{4}}$. With the version of Stirling's theorem given in Lemma ϵ in [10] we can now bound the second term in (5). Finally, using Titchmarsh's expression for $R(s)$, we note that $R(s)t^{-\frac{3}{4}}$ is decreasing in t provided that $t > (5/2)^3$. A computation of the constants involved proves the lemma. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem 1 for large t .

Write the sum in (4) as

$$\sum_{n \leq A_0 t^{\frac{1}{3}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} + \sum_{A_0 t^{\frac{1}{3}} < n \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2\pi}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - it}$$

provided that the interval of summation in the second sum is non-empty, that is, provided that

$$t_0 > A_0^6 (2\pi)^3. \quad (7)$$

The trivial estimate gives

$$\left| \sum_{n \leq A_0 t^{\frac{1}{3}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} \right| \leq \sum_{n \leq A_0 t^{\frac{1}{3}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2A_0^{\frac{1}{2}} t^{\frac{1}{6}} - 1.$$

Now consider

$$X_j = A_0 k^j t^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

where $k > 1$ is a parameter to be determined later, and $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, J$, where

$$J \leq \frac{\frac{1}{6} \log t - \log \left(A_0 (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)}{\log k} + 1.$$

Also, let $N_j = [X_j]$ be the integer part of X_j . It follows that

$$\sum_{A_0 t^{\frac{1}{3}} < n \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2\pi}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}-it} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{n=N_{j-1}+1}^{\min\{N_j, \sqrt{\frac{t}{2\pi}}\}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}-it},$$

whence, by partial summation we have

$$\left| \sum_{A_0 t^{\frac{1}{3}} < n \leq \sqrt{\frac{t}{2\pi}}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}-it} \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{X_{j-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \max_{L \leq N_j - N_{j-1}} \left| \sum_{n=N_{j-1}+1}^{N_{j-1}+L} e^{-it \log n} \right|. \quad (8)$$

Denote the sum over n in (8) by S_j . We may estimate S_j using Lemmas 1 and 2. First apply Lemma 2 to S_j and thence apply Lemma 1 to the resulting

$$\sum_{m,K} = \sum_{n=N_{j-1}+1}^{N_{j-1}+K} e^{-it(\log(n+m) - \log n)}.$$

Choose $M = [k^j \theta] + 1$, for some θ to be determined later. We impose the addition restriction that $M \geq 2$ so as to use the bounds in (10) without worry.

We need to determine V and W in Lemma 1. We have

$$f(x) = -\frac{t}{2\pi} (\log(x+m) - \log x), \quad |f''(x)| = \frac{tm}{2\pi} \left(\frac{m+2x}{x^2(x+m)^2} \right).$$

Since $(m+2x)/(x(x+m))^2$ is decreasing in both x and m we take $m = 0, x = A_0 k^{j-1} t^{\frac{1}{3}}$, and $m = M - 1 \leq k^j \theta, x = A_0 k^j t^{\frac{1}{3}}$ to find that $1/W \leq |f''(x)| \leq 1/V$, where

$$V = \frac{\pi A_0^3 k^{3j}}{k^3 m}, \quad W = \frac{\pi k^{3j} A_0^3}{m} \left(1 + \frac{\theta}{A_0 t_0^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right)^2.$$

In order to apply Lemma 1 it remains only to note that

$$L \leq (k-1)X_{j-1} + 1 \leq (k-1)A_0 k^{j-1} t^{\frac{1}{3}} + 1. \quad (9)$$

One may now apply Lemma 1 to find that

$$\left| \sum_{m,K} \right| \leq A_1 t^{\frac{1}{3}} m^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-\frac{1}{2}j} + A_2 t^{\frac{1}{3}} m k^{-2j} + A_3 m^{-\frac{1}{2}} k^{\frac{3}{2}j} + 3,$$

where

$$A_1 = \frac{2\sqrt{2}(k-1)k^2Y_0}{\pi A_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad A_2 = \frac{2(k-1)k^2}{\pi A_0^2}, \quad A_3 = 2\sqrt{2}A_0^{\frac{3}{2}}Y_0, \quad Y_0 = 1 + \frac{\theta}{A_0 t_0^{\frac{1}{3}}}.$$

One of the advantages of using Lemma 1 over Lemma 3 in [1] is that, according to (9), $L-1$ generates only one term.

The displayed formulae on page 1277 of [1] show that

$$\sum_{1 \leq m \leq M-1} \left(1 - \frac{m}{M}\right) m^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{4}{15} M^{\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M-1} \left(1 - \frac{m}{M}\right) m^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{4}{3} M^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (10)$$

Applying this gives

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \left(1 - \frac{m}{M}\right) \left| \sum_{m,K} \right| \leq \frac{4}{15} A_1 t^{\frac{1}{3}} M^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{-\frac{1}{2}j} + \frac{1}{6} A_2 t^{\frac{1}{3}} M k^{-2j} + \frac{4}{3} A_3 M^{-\frac{1}{2}} k^{\frac{3}{2}j} + \frac{3}{2}.$$

Return now to Lemma 2

$$|S_j|^2 \leq \frac{L(L+M-1)}{M} + 2(L+M-1) \left(\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^{M-1} \left(1 - \frac{m}{M}\right) \left| \sum_{m,K} \right| \right).$$

For $\alpha > 0$, $(L+M-1)M^\alpha$ is an increasing function of M ; $(L+M-1)/M$ is decreasing. We use an upper bound for the numerator and a lower bound for the denominator in $(L+M-1)/M^{1/2}$. With $M = [k^j \theta] + 1$ we have,

$$|S_j|^2 \leq B_1 k^j t^{\frac{2}{3}} + B_2 t^{\frac{2}{3}} + B_3 k^j t^{\frac{1}{3}} + B_4 k^{2j} t^{\frac{1}{3}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 &= \frac{(k-1)^2 A_0^2}{k^2 \theta} \left(1 + \frac{1}{(k-1) A_0 t_0^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{\theta k}{(k-1) A_0 t_0^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right) \\ A_5 &= \frac{2(k-1) A_0}{k} \left(1 + \frac{1}{(k-1) A_0 t_0^{\frac{1}{3}}} + \frac{\theta k}{(k-1) A_0 t_0^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right) \\ A_6 &= \frac{4}{15} A_1 \theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k\theta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad A_7 = \frac{A_2 \theta}{6} \left(1 + \frac{1}{k\theta} \right) \\ A_8 &= \frac{4 A_3}{3 \theta^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \quad B_1 = A_4 + A_5 A_6, \quad B_2 = A_5 A_7, \quad B_3 = \frac{3}{2} A_5, \quad B_4 = A_5 A_8. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Using the inequality $\sqrt{(x+y+\dots)} \leq \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y} + \dots$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{X_{j-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}} |S_j| &\leq \frac{k^{\frac{1}{2}}}{A_0^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left((\sqrt{B_1} t^{\frac{1}{6}} + \sqrt{B_3}) \sum_{j=1}^J 1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{B_2} t^{\frac{1}{6}} \sum_{j=1}^J k^{-\frac{1}{2}j} + \sqrt{B_4} \sum_{j=1}^J k^{\frac{1}{2}j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^J k^{-\frac{1}{2}j} = k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1 - k^{-\frac{1}{2}J}}{1 - k^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \right),$$

this gives

$$\sum_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{X_{j-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}} |S_j| \leq \left(\frac{k}{A_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (C_1 t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t + C_2 t^{\frac{1}{6}} + C_3 t^{\frac{1}{12}} + C_4 \log t + C_5),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \frac{\sqrt{B_1}}{6 \log k}, \quad C_2 = \sqrt{B_1} \left(1 - \frac{\log(A_0(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}})}{\log k} \right) + \frac{\sqrt{B_2} k^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{1 - k^{-\frac{1}{2}}} \\ C_3 &= \frac{\sqrt{B_4} k}{A_0^{\frac{1}{2}} (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}} (k^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1)} - \frac{\sqrt{B_2} A_0^{\frac{1}{2}} (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{4}}}{k(1 - k^{-\frac{1}{2}})}, \quad C_4 = \frac{\sqrt{B_3}}{6 \log k} \\ C_5 &= \sqrt{B_3} \left(1 - \frac{(\log A_0(2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}})}{\log k} \right) - \frac{\sqrt{B_4} k^{\frac{1}{2}}}{k^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| \leq D_1 t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t + D_2 t^{\frac{1}{6}} + D_3 t^{\frac{1}{12}} + D_4 \log t + D_5,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= 2C_1 \left(\frac{k}{A_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad D_2 = 2 \left(2A_0^{\frac{1}{2}} + C_2 \left(\frac{k}{A_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right), \quad D_3 = 2C_3 \left(\frac{k}{A_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \\ D_4 &= 2C_4 \left(\frac{k}{A_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad D_5 = 2 \left(C_5 \left(\frac{k}{A_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 + \frac{0.77}{t_0^{\frac{1}{4}}} + \frac{1.62}{t_0^{\frac{3}{4}}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

To reduce the right side of (12) as much as possible it is desirable to choose a large value of t_0 . We shall, in the next section, use (1) to handle smaller values of t . With this in mind, the choice

$$k = 1.16, \quad \theta = 7.5, \quad A_0 = 3.37, \quad t_0 = 5.867 \times 10^9$$

means that $|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| \leq 0.732 t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t$ for $t \geq t_0$, (7) is satisfied, and that $M \geq 2$. We now turn our attention to $t < 5.867 \times 10^9$.

4 Proof of Theorem 1 for small t

Lemma 4. *For $t \in [2, 5.867 \times 10^9]$ we have*

$$|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| < 0.732 t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t.$$

Proof. The trivial bound (1) is tighter than our new bound at $t = 5.867 \times 10^9$ and remains so for t all the way down to $t = 226.7088 \dots$. We checked the range $[2, 230]$ rigorously by computer as follows.

We implemented an interval arithmetic version of the Euler–MacLaurin summation formula that, given an interval $\underline{t}$ returns an interval that includes $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$ for all $t \in \underline{t}$. We divided the line segment $[2, 230]$ into pieces of length $1/1024$ and for each piece, checked that $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$ did not exceed our bound. Specifically, if we are considering $\underline{t} = [a, a + 1/1024]$ and we know that for $t \in \underline{t}$ that $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \in [x, y]$, then we check $y < 0.732a^{\frac{1}{6}} \log a$. No counter examples exist for $t \in [2, 230]$ and this establishes the lemma. $\square$

Corollary 2. *For t real and $Q \geq 4.678$ we have*

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| < 0.732|Q + it|^{\frac{1}{6}} \log |Q + it|.$$

Proof. For $|t| \geq 2$ we use Lemma 4. For $t \in (-2, 2)$ we know that $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$ attains a maximum at $t = 0$ so we determine a Q such that

$$|\zeta(\frac{1}{2})| < 0.732Q^{\frac{1}{6}} \log Q$$

and we are done. $\square$

5 Conclusion

Since an Euler–MacLaurin computation of $\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)$ becomes inefficient as t increases, we also implemented an interval version of the Riemann–Siegel formula (R-S) for $t \geq 200$. Above this height we have explicit error bounds due to Gabcke [2]. The only nuance is that the main sum of R-S runs from 1 to $\lfloor \sqrt{t/2\pi} \rfloor$ and we must be careful not to compute with intervals $\underline{t} = [a, b]$ such that $\lfloor \sqrt{a/2\pi} \rfloor \neq \lfloor \sqrt{b/2\pi} \rfloor$. We get around this by using Euler–MacLaurin for such intervals.

So armed, we can continue to compute $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$ for $t \in [a, b]$ and each time we come across an interval where (possibly) $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i[a, b])|$ sets a new record $[x, y]$, we store a and y . Running through the data files produced, it is a trivial matter to find an A such that $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| < At^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t$ throughout the range. Our results are summarised in Table 1.

It seems that the bound in Theorem 1 is still very far from optimal.

References

- [1] Y. F. Cheng and S. W. Graham. Explicit estimates for the Riemann zeta function. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.*, 34(4):1261–1280, 2004.
- [2] W. Gabcke. *Neue Herleitung und explizite Restabschätzung der Riemann-Siegel Formel*. PhD thesis, Göttingen, 1979.

Table 1: Bounds on $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \leq At^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t$ for ranges of t .

t	A
$[2, 200]$	0.7090
$[200, 10^3]$	0.4873
$[10^3, 10^4]$	0.4682
$[10^4, 10^5]$	0.4217
$[10^5, 10^6]$	0.3765
$[10^6, 10^7]$	0.3238
$[10^7, 10^8]$	0.2854

- [3] L. Habsieger. Explicit approximate functional equations for various classes of Dirichlet series. *Ramanujan J.*, 9:93–110, 2005.
- [4] M. N. Huxley. Exponential sums and the Riemann zeta function, V. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 90:1–41, 2005.
- [5] A. A. Karatsuba and M. A. Korolev. Approximation of an exponential sum by a shorter one. *Dokl. Math.*, 75(1):36–38, 2007.
- [6] R. S. Lehman. Separation of zeros of the Riemann zeta-function. *Math. Comp.*, 20(96):523–541, 1966.
- [7] R. S. Lehman. On the distribution of zeros of the Riemann zeta-function. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 3(20):303–320, 1970.
- [8] D. J. Platt. Computing $\pi(x)$ analytically. *Math. Comp.*, 2013. To appear. Preprint available at arXiv:1203.5712v3 [math.NT].
- [9] O. Ramaré. An explicit density estimate for Dirichlet L -series. In preparation, 2013.
- [10] E. C. Titchmarsh. The zeros of the Riemann zeta-function. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A*, 151:234–255, 1935.
- [11] E. C. Titchmarsh. *The Theory of the Riemann zeta-function*. Oxford Science Publications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2nd edition, 1986.
- [12] T. S. Trudgian. Improvements to Turing’s Method. *Math. Comp.*, 80:2259–2279, 2011.
- [13] T. S. Trudgian. An improved upper bound for the argument of the Riemann zeta-function on the critical line II. *J. Number Theor.*, 134:280–292, 2014.
- [14] A. M. Turing. Some calculations of the Riemann zeta-function. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 3(3):99–117, 1953.